UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,821	04/27/2001	Doo Sang Park	2080-3-18	3336

35884 7590 08/10/2004		EXAMINER
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA, P.C.		AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA, P.C.
801 SOUTH FIQUEROA STREET
14TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 April 2001_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 April 2001_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montalbano (U.S. 5,838,775) in view of Scordato (U.S. 4,881,259).

4. As per claims 1 and 10, Montalbano teaches an information display apparatus comprising:

A gateway system for converting protocols... (column 5, lines 42-45).

Although Montalbano teaches the use of a gateway, Montalbano does not define exactly what he uses the gateway for. However, the protocol conversion between an external network and a local network is deemed to be inherent to the Montalbano system because that is one of the main functions of a gateway. Without the use of a gateway, the Montalbano system would be inoperative over networks;

A plurality of terminals connected... (column 5, lines 50-52);

An information server for storing various information... (column 4, lines 7-13);

An information server for transmitting information to each terminal... (column 4, lines 14-15);

Montalbano fails to disclose the step of verifying a terminal has an on-hook status. However, Scordata discloses a phone with an on-hook and an off-hook status (column 18, lines 45-47, 50-51, 56-58, figure 7b part 308, 310, and 316).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have clearly recognized that it is quite advantageous for the screen phone disclosed by Montalbano to have an on-hook/off-hook status control. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate Scordata's on-hook/off-hook status control with Montalbano's screen phone so that information sent to Montalbano's phone would never be lost;

Montalbano discloses the display of information on a display unit of the terminal (column 3, lines 15-17).

5.   As per claims 2 and 11, Montalbano teaches the use of PC phones and Internet phones (column 3, lines 10-11). Montalbano fails to teach the use of Internet protocols for data communication when using a PC phone or an Internet phone. However, the use of Internet protocols is deemed to be inherent to the Montalbano system because in order for PC phones and Internet phones to be operative for data communication they must use Internet protocols.

6.   As per claims 3 and 12, Montalbano teaches a memory means for storing information transmitted from the information server, and a control means for controlling the storing of the transmitted information in the memory means of the terminal (column 2, lines 15-18).

7.   As per claims 4 and 13, Montalbano fails to teach a control means for judging the call status of the terminal. However, Scordata discloses a phone with an on-hook and an off-hook status (column 18, lines 45-47, 50-51, 56-58, figure 7b part 308, 310, and 316).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have clearly recognized that it is quite advantageous for the screen phone taught by Montalbano to have an on-hook/off-hook status. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to incorporate Scordata's on-hook/off-hook status control with Montalbano's screen phone so that information sent to Montalbano's phone would never be lost in the system as taught by Montalbano.

8.   As per claims 5 and 14, Montalbano fails to teach the use of a status indicator indicating whether the phone is in on-hook or off-hook status. However, Scordata discloses a phone with an on-hook and an off-hook status indicator (column 18, lines 45-47, 50-51, 56-58, figure 7b part 308, 310, and 316).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have clearly recognized that it is quite advantageous for the screen phone taught by Montalbano to have an on-hook/off-hook status indicator. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to incorporate Scordata's on-hook/off-hook status with Montalbano's screen phone so that information sent to Montalbano's phone would not be lost.

9.   As per claims 6 and 15, Montalbano teaches a terminal which includes a display

means... (column 3, lines 15-17 and lines 25-27).

10.   As per claims 7 and 16, Montalbano teaches an information server including a

memory means for storing various... (column 4, lines 7-14). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that a control to

determine the call status of each of the plurality of terminals would have been

advantageous in order to guard against the loss of information.

11.   As per claims 8 and 17, Montalbano teaches an information server that transmits

the information stored in the memory to the terminal (column 4, lines 14-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention that the terminal must be in an on-hook status in order to receive

information. The risk of losing information exists if a phone is not able to receive

information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to verify the on-hook status of a phone before sending information

to the phone.

12.   As per claims 9 and 18, Montalbano fails to teach a control means of the

information server that updates the contents of the memory when new information is

received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention that a control means of the information server that updates the

contents of the memory when new information is received would be beneficial to ensure

that new information received is not lost. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include a control means to save

updates to memory when received.

13.   As per claim 19, Montalbano teaches an information display method comprising:

        Storing information such as... (column 2, lines 31-39);

        Transmission of stored information to a plurality of terminal... (column 4, lines 14-

15).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention that the terminal must be in an on-hook status in order to receive

information. The risk of losing information exists if a phone is not able to receive

information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to verify the on-hook status of a phone before sending information

to the phone;

        Control of the terminals to display... (column 3, lines 15-17).

14.   As per claim 20, Montalbano teaches the step of transmitting stored

information... (column 4, lines 15-22 and 60-61).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention for the information server to have a pre-selected terminal to send

information to. Having a pre-selected location to send information to prevents the loss

of information and prevents information from being sent to the wrong location.

15.   As per claim 21, Montalbano teaches a method that comprises:

        The storing of received information... (column 2, lines 15-18);

Montalbano fails to teach a control means for judging the call status of the terminal. However, Scordata discloses a phone with an on-hook and an off-hook status (column 18, lines 45-47, 50-51, 56-58, figure 7b part 308, 310, and 316).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have clearly recognized that it is quite advantageous for the screen phone disclosed by Montalbano to have an on-hook/off-hook status. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate Scordata's on-hook/off-hook status with Montalbano's screen phone so that information sent to Montalbano's phone would not be lost;

Displaying of the stored information... (column 3, lines 15-17 and 25-27).

16.   As per claim 22, it is interpreted that the applicant is referring to what is well known as "screensaver" technology. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that this type of technology would have been beneficial in order to prevent images from becoming permanently etched on the screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate screensaver technology in order to prevent a damaged screen.

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wilson (U.S. 6,169,734) discloses an Internet phone set.

Vaudreuil (U.S. 5,740,230) discloses a directory management system and method.

Haddock et al. (U.S. 5,657,378) discloses a digital screen phone terminal with graphical user interface.

Schuster et al. (U.S. 6,446,127) discloses a system and method for providing user mobility services on a telephony network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is 703-305-0447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached at (703) 305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)308-5358.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [benjamin.ailes@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file.

PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record

includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published

in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG

89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703)305-3900.

baa

JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER